



I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, on March 11, 1994

Date of Deposit

Maxwell J Petersen

Name of applicant, assignee or  
Registered Representative

Maxwell J Petersen

Signature

March 11, 1994

Date of Signature

PATENT

Case No. 1391/1275

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: )  
)  
MICHAEL MCHALE, ET AL. )  
)  
Serial No.: 08/044,240 ) Group Art Unit: 1302  
)  
Filed: April 7, 1993 ) Examiner: C. Sherrer  
)  
For: MULTI-PHASE SHEETED )  
CHEWING GUM AND METHOD )  
AND APPARATUS FOR MAKING )

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Honorable Commissioner of  
Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

In response to the second Office Action mailed on March 3, 1994, Applicants provisionally elect the product made by the process of Example 1 as the species, in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestion in paragraph 4 of the first Office Action, mailed on December 27, 1993.

The Applicants respectfully traverse the species restriction requirement for the following reasons. First, the species restriction requirement does not comply with M.P.E.P. § 814 which states, in pertinent part:

As pointed out in Ex parte Ljungstrom, 1905 C.D. 541, 119 O.G. 2335, the particular limitations in the claims and the reasons why such limitations are considered to restrict the claims to a particular

#  
C  
2594  
D.W.  
SUBMITTED  
MAY 13 1994

disclosed species should be mentioned if necessary to make the requirement clear. (underline supplied)

In the present case, the Examiner has referred to no specific species claims or claim limitations, or given any reason why any group of species claims might be patentably distinct from each other. Without this information, there appears to be no foundation for the species restriction requirement, and the reasons for the restriction requirement are not clear.

Second, the species restriction requirement does not conform to M.P.E.P. § 808.01(a), which sets forth the procedure for determining if a species restriction is appropriate:

Where there is no disclosure of relationship between species, they are independent inventions. . . There must be a patentable difference between the species as claimed. . . (underlines supplied).

Contrary to M.P.E.P. § 808.01(a), there is an express disclosure of relationship between Applicants' Examples 1, 2 and 3, in the Applicants' specification:

Example 2 is carried out the same as Example 1 except that the high potency sweeteners are removed from the formulation for the first slab (page 20, lines 25-27)

Example 3 is carried out the same as Example 1 except that a candy formulation is used as the second mass (page 21, lines 1-2)

Because neither M.P.E.P. § 814 or § 808.01(a) have been satisfied, Applicants respectfully submit that the

species restriction requirement is manifestly improper, and  
should be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

*Maxwell J. Petersen*

Maxwell J. Petersen  
Reg. No. 32,772

WILLIAN BRINKS HOFER  
GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. Box 10395  
Chicago, Illinois 60610  
(312) 321-4200

C:94MJP-1:1275-B.AMD



TRANSMITTAL LETTER			Case No. 1391/1275
Serial No. 08/044,240	Filing Date April 7, 1993	Examiner C. Sherrer	Group Art Unit 1302
Inventor(s) Michael McHale, et al.			
Title of Invention MULTI-PHASE SHEETED CHEWING GUM AND METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR MAKING			

TO THE COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Transmitted herewith is a response in the above-identified to the Office Action of March 3, 1994.

- ☐ Small entity status of this application under 37 CFR § 1.27 has been established by verified statement previously submitted.
- ☐ A verified statement to establish small entity status under 37 CFR §§ 1.9 and 1.27 is enclosed.
- ☒ Response to Office Action.
- ☐ No additional fee is required.
- ☐ The fee has been calculated as shown below:

	Claims Remaining After Amendment		Highest No. Previously Paid For	Present Extra
Total		Minus		
Indep.		Minus		
First Presentation of Multiple Dep. Claim				

Small Entity		or	Other Than Small Entity	
Rate	Add'l Fee		Rate	Add'l Fee
x \$11 =	\$		x \$22 =	\$
x \$37 =	\$		x \$74 =	\$
+\$115 =	\$		+ \$230 =	\$
total add'l fee	\$		total add'l fee	\$

- ☐ Please charge Deposit Account No. 23-1925 (WILLIAM BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE) in the amount of \$ \_\_\_\_\_. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.
- ☐ A check in the amount of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ to cover the filing fee is enclosed.
- ☒ The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional filing fees required under 37 CFR § 1.16 and any patent application processing fees under 37 CFR § 1.17 associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1925. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.
- ☒ I hereby petition under 37 CFR § 1.136(a) for any extension of time required to ensure that this paper is timely filed. Please charge any associated fees which have not otherwise been paid to Deposit Account No. 23-1925. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

*Maxwell G. Petersen*  
Maxwell G. Petersen  
Registration No. 32,772  
Attorney for Applicant

WILLIAM BRINKS HOFER  
GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200